

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 1, 9, 15, and 27 are independent and claims 21-29 are newly added. In the Office Action, claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Watanabe (U.S. Pat. No. 5,317,746). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

INTERVIEW CONDUCTED

The Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Nguyen and Primary Examiner Courtenay for granting the personal interview conducted on January 21, 2004. During the interview, the 102 rejection of claims 1, 9, and 15 over Watanabe was discussed. It was agreed that Watanabe fails to teach or suggest a “multicasted message”, and thus the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 102 rejection. Claims 1-29 are now believed to be in condition for allowance.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Watanabe.

When making a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102, a necessary condition is that the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. (see MPEP, §706.02). If any claimed element is missing from the applied reference, then the claim is distinguishable over the reference.

Independent claim 1 recites, “receiving a multicasted message”, and claims 9 and 15 recite similar features. As agreed in the interview, Watanabe fails to teach or suggest a multicasted message. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are believed to be allowable.

NEWLY ADDED CLAIMS

Claims 21-29 are newly added. Claims 21-22, 23-24, and 25-26 are dependent on claims 1, 9, and 15 respectively. These claims are believed to be allowable for at least the same reason as their associated independent claim is believed to be allowable.

In addition claims 21, 23, and 25 are directed to receiving a multicasted message via a network. Watanabe fails to teach or suggest a network. Instead, Watanabe discloses modeling a processor module including a CPU and memory as a client server architecture. The CPU and memory of Watanabe do not include a network or receiving a multicasted message via a network. Accordingly, claims 21, 23, and 25 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 22, 24, and 26 are directed to determining whether a response includes a response changing the state of data stored in a host. This feature is also not taught or suggested by Watanabe, and claims 22, 24, and 26 are believed to be allowable.

Newly added independent claim 27 includes features similar to claim 1 in means-plus-function format and is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons claim 1 is believed to be allowable. In addition claim 27 recites a network not taught or suggested by Watanabe. Accordingly, claims 27-29 are believed to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

As all of the outstanding rejections have been traversed and all of the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, the Applicant respectfully requests issuance of a Notice of Allowability. If the undersigned attorney can assist in any matters regarding examination of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 22, 2004

By



Ashok K. Mannava
Registration No. 45,301

MANNAVA & KANG, P.C.
281 Murtha Street
Alexandria, VA 22304
(703) 628-1461
(703) 991-1162 (fax)